



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/965,075	09/27/2001	Richard G. Hartmann	END920010023US1	3378
7590	06/13/2006		EXAMINER	
IBM Corporation Intellectual Property Law (Dept. 917, Bldg. 006-1) 3605 Highway 52 North Rochester, MN 55901-7829				NGUYEN, DUSTIN
				ART UNIT
				PAPER NUMBER
				2154

DATE MAILED: 06/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/965,075	HARTMANN ET AL.
	Examiner Dustin Nguyen	Art Unit 2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 April 2006.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                            2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) 1-3,9-15,17,20-23 and 26 is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 4-8,16,18,19,24,25 and 27 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1 – 27 are presented for examination.

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 04/17/2006 has been entered.

### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments filed 04/17/2006 concerning claims 19, 24 and 25 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

4. In response to applicant's arguments, the recitation "in which client applications at a client workstation selectively communicates with a first server application over a half duplex block mode interface in half duplex block mode and with a second server application in via said half duplex block mode interface in full duplex character interactive mode" of claim 19, the recitation "for operating a display in a half duplex block mode environment selectively in half

duplex block mode and in full duplex character interactive input/output mode using an application layer half duplex block mode interface, when communicating in said full duplex character interactive input/output mode" of claim 24, and the recitation "for operating a display in a half duplex block mode environment selectively to communicate in half duplex block mode and full duplex character interactive mode according to method steps executed in full duplex character interactive mode" of claim 25, have not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 4-8, 16, 18 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

A. The following terms lack antecedent basis:

I. workstation claim 16

II. said server claim 18

B. The claimed language in the following claims are not clearly defined:

I. As per claim 4, the limitation of “connecting said client workstation a first server application” is not clearly explained, this limitation should be “connecting said client workstation **to** a first server application”.

II. As per claim 4, the limitation of “operating said client to communicate a half duplex block mode interface said first server application” is not clearly explained, this limitation should be “operating said client to communicate **over** a half duplex block interface **with** said first server application”.

III. As per claim 16, the limitation of “ said client application automatically transferring said key stroke from said workstation over said half duplex block mode interface **to** said second server application” is not clearly explained, this limitation should be “said client application automatically transferring said key stroke from said workstation over said half duplex block mode interface **to** said second server application”.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

7. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. As per claim 25, it is claiming a computer program product which is not concrete and tangible.

For a claim to be statutory under 35 USC 101 the following two conditions must be met:

- 1) In the claim, the practical application of an algorithm or idea result in a useful, concrete, tangible result, AND
- 2) The claim provides a limitation in the technological art that enables a useful, concrete, tangible result.

As to the technology requirement, note MPEP Section iV 2(b). Also note In Re Waldbaum, 173USPQ 430 (CCPA 1972) which teaches "useful arts" is synonymous with technological arts", In re Musgrave, 167USPQ 280 (CCPA1970), In re Johnston, 183USPQ 172 (CCPA 1974), and In re Toma, 197USPQ 852 (CCPA 1978), all teach a technological requirements.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

9. Claims 19, 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kroll et al. [ US Patent No 5,159,684 ].

10. As per claim 1, Kroll discloses the invention substantially as claimed including a display for character interactive input/output in a half duplex block mode environment in which client

applications at a client workstation selectively communicates with a first server application over a half duplex block mode interface in half duplex block mode and with a second server application in via said half duplex block mode interface in full duplex character interactive mode, said client workstation, comprising:

    a one character [ i.e. a byte or 8-bits ] [ col 1, lines 59-62 ], auto enter, non-displayable buffer for receiving from an input device an input character for communication to a server application [ col 9, lines 24-29 and lines 35-38 ]; and  
    an output field for displaying an echo character from said server application [ col 3, lines 13-17 ];

    thereby transferring single key strokes as they are entered at said client workstation even though operating in said half duplex block mode environment in which character sequences are normally transferred [ col 1, lines 47-52; and col 11, lines 5-35 ].

11. As per claims 24 and 25, they are rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 19.

12. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 4-8, 16, 18, 19, 24, 25 and 27 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

13. A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire **3 (three) months and 0 (zero) days** from the mail date of this letter. Failure to respond within the period for response will result in **ABANDONMENT** of the application (see 35 U.S.C 133, M.P.E.P 710.02, 710.02(b)).

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dustin Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3971. The examiner can normally be reached on flex.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached at (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Dustin Nguyen

Examiner

Art Unit 2154

  
JOHN FOLLANSBEE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100